## **EXHIBIT A**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION

SONY CORPORATION, a Japanese Corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. SA CV08-01135-RGK(FMOx)

VIZIO, INC.,

Defendant.

MEET AND CONFER

Los Angeles, California

Thursday, July 23, 2009

Reported by: JILL GLANTZ CSR No. 11341

JOB No. 117120

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

```
Page 2
 1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                          WESTERN DIVISION
 3
     SONY CORPORATION, a
     Japanese Corporation,
 5
                   Plaintiff,
 6
                              No. SA CV08-01135-RGK(FMOx)
             VS.
 7
     VIZIO, INC.,
 8
                   Defendant.
 9
10
11
12
13
14
          MEET AND CONFER, at 865 South Figueroa Street,
16
     Tenth Floor, Los Angeles, California, beginning at
17
     1:09 p.m. and ending at 2:27 p.m. on Thursday,
18
     July 23, 2009, before JILL GLANTZ, Certified Shorthand
     Reporter No. 11341.
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
Page 3
     APPEARANCES:
 2
     For Plaintiff:
 4
          QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP
                RORY S. MILLER
 5
                TOM PEASE (Telephonic appearance)
                TODD KENNEDY (Telephonic appearance)
 6
                PETER KLIVANS (Telephonic appearance)
                HEATHER BELVILLE (Telephonic appearance)
 7
          Attorneys at Law
          865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
          Los Angeles, California 90017
           (213) 443-3000
 9
10
     For Defendant:
11
          JONES DAY
          BY:
                STEVEN J. CORR
12
                RYAN McCRUM (Telephonic appearance)
          Attorney at Law
13
          555 South Flower Street, Fiftieth Floor
          Los Angeles, California 90071
14
           (213) 489-3939
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

- Los Angeles, California, Thursday, July 23, 2009
- 1:09 p.m. 2:27 p.m.

3

- 4 MR. MILLER: Rory Miller, Quinn Emanuel Los
- $^5$  Angeles on behalf of Sony.
- 6 MR. PEASE: Tom Pease, Quinn Emanuel New York
- on behalf of Sony.
- MR. KENNEDY: Todd Kennedy, Quinn Emanuel San
- <sup>9</sup> Francisco on behalf of Sony.
- MR. KLIVANS: Peter Klivans, Quinn Emanuel San
- 11 Francisco on behalf of Sony.
- MS. BELVILLE: Heather Belville, Quinn Emanuel,
- Silicon Valley office representing Sony.
- MR. McCRUM: Ryan McCrum, Jones Day on behalf
- of Vizio.
- MR. CORR: Steve Corr from Jones Day Los
- Angeles on behalf of Vizio.
- MR. MILLER: Okay, gentlemen. Why don't we go
- ahead and get started. Peter, do you want to take the
- first whack at this or Tom or somebody?
- MR. PEASE: I think Todd is going to start.
- MR. KENNEDY: This is Todd Kennedy. Why don't
- we start with Sony's Interrogatory Number 3, which
- requests that they seize for Vizio's contentions of
- non infringement. Vizio's response is just a list of

- claim elements. Sony's position is that Vizio's
- response needs to include all relevant factual bases
- regarding the structure and operation of Vizio
- 4 television. None of that information is currently in
- <sup>5</sup> Vizio's response.
- 6 MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum. In our
- <sup>7</sup> letter we advised you that the Interrogatory Number 3
- 8 asks Vizio to provide a claim chart setting forth the
- bases for Vizio's first affirmative defense that it
- does not infringe the patent suit. And in response,
- Vizio provided claim charts for each of the more than
- 100 asserted patent claims and setting forth for each
- limitation -- and set forth each limitation that it
- currently contends is not present in Vizio's products
- or that Sony has not shown by a preponderance of the
- evidence to be present in Vizio's products. In our
- view, this is exactly what Sony requested, and we did
- in fact provide a sufficient answer.
- And as I also noted in my letter, to the
- extent that Sony is having any difficulty
- understanding Vizio's contentions, our position is
- that is a result of Sony's refusal to perform or agree
- to perform the first step of any non infringement
- analysis, which is claim construction. If Sony would
- agree to exchange constructions, including a means

- 1 plus function terms, then we could identify the
- structure required by such claims, and we think it
- would then be a lot more clear what structure we are
- $^4$  claiming is not present in Vizio's products. But
- that's another dispute that we have ongoing. As you
- know, Sony is not agreeing to do that; and therefore,
- we think these responses are adequate, especially
- given that you have asserted over 100 claims,
- 9 thousands of claim limitations against dozens of Vizio
- products.
- I also want to note that during our last
- meet and confer you had indicated that Sony expected
- to provide claim charts regarding your validity
- $^{14}$  contentions that are the same nature of our
- infringement contention. So we don't think it's fair
- for Sony to insist that Vizio provide a certain level
- of information in response to interrogatories that
- Sony itself is unwilling to provide in response to
- similar interrogatories.
- So that's our position on that. I don't
- think any of that is new to you. We have set that out
- in the letter of correspondence and talked about it in
- the past.
- MR. KENNEDY: This is Todd. Why don't we focus
- on one particular fact that Vizio has raised elsewhere

- but not included in its claim charts. In a May 20,
- 2 2009 letter, Vizio represented that one of its
- televisions does not infringe the 182 patent because
- 4 it analyzes the entire frame to generate the histogram
- <sup>5</sup> distribution that accumulates luminous data into 32
- <sup>6</sup> BINS, B-I-N-S. That is a very specific factual
- <sup>7</sup> allegation regarding non infringement that is clearly
- 8 responsive to Sony's interrogatories, and yet that
- <sup>9</sup> fact does not appear anywhere in Vizio's response.
- Why not?
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum again. I
- think you, Sony, has already acknowledged, Todd, Vizio
- is not required to set forth all information about its
- products in an interrogatory response. And I would
- refer you to your letter of June 18 to me that says
- that Sony does not agree that it is required to
- include in its interrogatory response all information
- about Vizio products that Sony provided to Vizio at an
- earlier time. And so it's not clear why Sony now
- believes it can insist on all such information in
- response to Sony's interrogatories.
- MR. KENNEDY: Ryan, this is Todd again. Your
- factual allegation regarding the histogram is
- according to your own Rule 11 motion a critical fact
- in Vizio's entire Rule 11 basis for that patent. It

- was based on that specific factual allegation. So
- it's not something that is an insignificant fact that
- doesn't need to be included in the claims charts.
- <sup>4</sup> This is a very significant factual allegation.
- $^{5}$  MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum again. Well,
- $^6$  that allegation and that fact is important to the
- <sup>7</sup> issue of Sony's Rule 11 basis for filing suit. And
- 8 the reason why in the context in which it came up was
- <sup>9</sup> when we had concerns about Sony's Rule 11 basis for
- bringing this suit. And the point about that
- particular function of Vizio's products, we raised
- that was because we felt that we had told you early on
- before this case was filed that Sony's -- or that
- $^{14}$  Vizio's products operated in a certain way. And
- despite telling you that, it doesn't appear that Sony
- has gone out and made any effort or attempt to confirm
- $^{17}$  whether or not that was true. So that issue and those
- representations about Vizio's products were raised in
- different contexts and were relevant to your Rule 11
- basis for bringing this action.
- MR. KENNEDY: Is it your position that the
- facts regarding histogram distribution is not relevant
- to Vizio's contention of non infringement?
- MR. McCRUM: I don't think I said that.
- MR. KENNEDY: So is it relevant or not?

- MR. McCRUM: Is what relevant?
- MR. KENNEDY: Is the fact about Vizio's
- 3 histogram distribution relevant to the issue of
- 4 infringement?
- MR. McCRUM: Certainly how Vizio's products
- function and operate is relevant to the issue of
- infringement, and on that limitation -- the relevant
- limitation here we have indicated has not met by
- <sup>9</sup> Vizio's products. So we have got hundreds of
- limitations. You're focusing in on one here. And if
- we start going into the specifics and details about
- every which way Vizio's products operate with regard
- to each limitation, then are you going to then ask for
- the same thing with respect to the thousand other
- 15 limitations?
- We provided claim charts to you on a
- limitation by limitation basis, and we were consistent
- in how we provided those charts. And we are confident
- and feel comfortable that those sufficiently answer
- your interrogatory.
- MR. PEASE: Ryan, this is Tom Pease. Vizio
- served an interrogatory on Sony asking for Sony's
- infringement contentions. We served a thousand page
- response that we since supplemented twice, and Vizio
- has still taken a position that those responses are

- <sup>1</sup> not sufficient.
- Now, Sony served the mirror image
- interrogatory on Vizio, and that asks Vizio to
- 4 identify those limitations that are not set forth and
- 5 to explain the basis for your contention that you
- don't infringe in light of our infringement
- <sup>7</sup> contentions. So all you have done is parrot the claim
- 8 language and say we don't meet the following
- 9 limitations.
- And yet what you have demanded that we do
- in our affirmative case is a lot more than simply say
- Vizio, you practice the following limitations. What
- you have asked us to do and what we have gone back to
- $^{14}$  the well and done several times and promised to do
- again as we get additional information is to provide a
- meaningful explanation of why it is based on the facts
- that are available to us that we think Vizio meets the
- limitations of the Sony asserted claims in this suit.
- So for you to say that you think you have
- answered the interrogatory when all you have done is
- 21 identify limitations that you don't believe Vizio
- meets, to me that sounds like we're at an impasse
- because we're obviously looking for more information
- there. And what really got us started on this is you
- sent us a letter at least a month ago, and you had a

- very detailed factual basis that you contend -- and we
- disagree -- but you contend means that Vizio does not
- $^3$  infringe at least one claim of the 182 patent. You
- qave us a detailed analysis of the histogram and the
- $^{5}$  way that's generated and the way it works, and you
- said that based on that Vizio doesn't infringe the 182
- <sup>7</sup> patent. Well, that's the kind of information that our
- 8 interrogatory was designed to elicit. We want to know
- 9 what it is Vizio believes is the reason it doesn't
- infringe.
- Now, this ties in with a lot of things.
- You mentioned the claim construction dispute. Well,
- in accordance with the schedule adopted by the court,
- $^{14}$  we don't think it's right or the time is right to
- disclose claim construction positions right now. And
- one reason we think that is that we haven't
- crystalized the factual disputes between the parties.
- But for your letter, which just happened to reveal
- your basis for believing you don't infringe one patent
- suit, we wouldn't know anything about your basis. We
- have given infringement contentions. We have promised
- to go back and supplement them, but we haven't heard
- from you why you think you don't infringe other than
- the parrot language of the claim.
- And if we're going to be able to reach a

- position where the parties actually know what the
- disputes are and are in a position to at some point
- write summary judgment motions and prepares cases for
- 4 trial, we are going to need that kind of information,
- and that's what we're looking for here.
- Just to pick up on one other point that
- you made, you said we took the position that we
- 8 weren't going to put in all the information that was
- <sup>9</sup> in the claim charts that were given to Vizio before
- this lawsuit was initiated. Our position actually
- was, look, we're not going to parrot every single word
- in those claim charts, but we did go back and we did
- include in our claim charts the relevant aspects of
- those charts. Yeah, we didn't cut word for word every
- single word that was in the presuit claim charts, but
- we did go back and we did amend our analysis to
- include the kind of information that was in there, to
- the extent that information reflected Sony's
- infringement contentions.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum again.
- Several points in response to that. The first is we
- have this underlying dispute about whether or not you
- should be required to provide claim constructions.
- That is the underlying problem here is Sony's refusal
- to agree to provide claim constructions on targeted

- terms that we believe are already in dispute and need
- to be construed. You can look at any federal circuit
- case addressing the issue of claim construction, and
- 4 you will see unanimously that the first step of any
- 5 claim -- of any infringement analysis is claim
- 6 construction. You cannot conduct a meaningful
- <sup>7</sup> infringement analysis prior to -- before claim
- 8 construction is conducted.
- Sony is skipping that necessary step and
- making it impossible for the parties to have -- to
- address the issue of infringement the way it should
- be. Sony's infringement allegations and contentions
- right now in our view are essentially useless without
- $^{14}$  claim construction. We still cannot tell where the
- disputes lie or what Sony's contentions are because we
- have no idea how you are construing these claims.
- You repeatedly offered to provide a list
- of proposed terms to be construed, starting with the
- means plus function terms, that we think once
- construed will shed significant light on the parties'
- infringement and non infringement contentions, and it
- will substantially narrow the issues for the court,
- the parties and for dispositive motion briefing. That
- is the underlying problem here with regard to
- infringement, and our position is that until we do

- that, our responses right now are the best they can
- $^2$  be.
- Now, my second point is, yes, we are
- 4 willing to supplement our non infringement
- 5 contentions. We are willing to do that once we
- for resolve this claim construction issue that we're
- <sup>7</sup> arguing about; two, when we're working with experts
- and we're continuing to work with experts regarding
- <sup>9</sup> infringement and non infringement issues. And you
- folks are supposedly seeking information from third
- parties in discovery that you yourselves claim are
- going to shed light on the issue of infringement that
- we will certainly incorporate into our non
- infringement contentions as well. Vizio is willing to
- supplement its non infringement contentions as it
- continues to obtain additional information.
- And lastly, the third thing is, you know,
- you have already indicated that your contentions
- regarding validity are basically going to be a
- limitation -- just a recitation of whatever
- limitations you think are missing from these prior
- references. Are you folks planning to go through and
- identify each limitation that is missing from those
- references and also give us an explanation as to why
- you believe those are missing?

- MR. KENNEDY: Ryan, this is Todd. As you know,
- those charts are going to be produced at the end of
- the month, and we can certainly talk about the charts
- <sup>4</sup> after Vizio has had its chance to review them.
- But I did have one question for you,
- 6 which is why is Vizio's statement about the histogram
- distribution not important enough to include in its
- 8 claim charts?
- 9 MR. McCRUM: We addressed that limitation and
- said that it was not satisfied and that Sony has not
- satisfied its burden of showing that that limitation
- is satisfied. That is our current position on
- infringement. And to the extent that we are going to
- supplement or have additional information that we want
- to include in our infringement contentions, we'll do
- $^{16}$  that.
- 17 It's not for Sony to sit there and
- dictate what should be our infringement and non
- infringement contentions. That's for Vizio to decide.
- 20 And right now we told you what they are, and we
- don't -- quite frankly, we don't believe that Sony has
- come even close to showing that most of the
- limitations in the asserted patents are satisfied by
- Vizio's products. I mean, let the record be clear,
- Vizio doesn't have to come forward with any evidence

- of non infringement. That's your burden of proof.
- And right now we think that it is nowhere close to
- being satisfied, and we can rest on that alone, and we
- 4 can decide to do that.
- Now, if you come forward with some
- infringement contentions in more detail and provide
- 7 claim constructions, then, you know, we will address
- 8 our non infringement contentions accordingly.
- MR. PEASE: Ryan, this is Tom. You said it's
- not for Sony to dictate what Vizio's non infringement
- contentions are going to be, and yet Vizio has had no
- problem trying to dictate what Sony's infringement
- contentions ought to be. We have gone back and
- supplemented our infringement contentions several
- times now, and we're planning to do it again because
- you complained it didn't give you enough information.
- Now, I suppose we can just wait until
- trial and simply say you meet these limitations,
- that's all we're going to say or at least wait until
- there is some disclosure and expert opinions, then
- that's going to hold for both parties. You can't say
- that it's not sufficient for Sony to just parrot the
- claim language when it sets forth an infringement
- contention and yet it's perfectly okay for Vizio to do
- that in its non infringement contentions. You know,

- that's just not going to work. This is discovery, and
- the whole point of discovery is to figure out what the
- other side's position is and crystalize disputes and
- figure out what the true disputes are and which ones
- 5 deserve a lot of attention as the parties develop
- their cases and which ones do not. You know, we want
- <sup>7</sup> to know which limitations aren't in dispute.
- 8 Along those lines, you say your non
- infringement contentions now are -- I think the
- expression you used "are as best as they can be." But
- based on your own letter, they clearly aren't. All
- you have told us is that you don't meet a particular
- limitation. You haven't told us why you don't meet
- that limitation, and your own letter shows that you
- know exactly why you think you don't meet that
- 16 limitation.
- You know, you said you guys are
- developing trial positions and refusing to disclose
- them to us in response to contention interrogatories.
- We don't think that's fair because we have been
- bending over backwards to try to accommodate every
- request from Vizio for additional information.
- And just one last point on claim
- construction. You say without formal disclosure of
- claim construction, proposed constructions and

- supporting evidence you're not in a position to
- develop your non infringement arguments. Like I said,
- your letter belies that.
- $^4$  And two, we would point out before the
- 5 court set a schedule which didn't include formal claim
- construction disclosures, Sony actually served an
- interrogatory on Vizio that asked for Vizio's proposed
- 8 constructions and supporting evidence, and we haven't
- 9 had any substantive information in response to that
- interrogatory.
- So if Vizio were serious in saying that
- the parties have a duty to disclose, even at this
- point before the issues have crystalized, their claim
- construction positions, Vizio itself hasn't lived up
- to that. There's not been single claim construction
- disclosed in response to that interrogatory. We
- haven't pressed you on it because after that
- interrogatory was served, the court adopted its
- schedule and made it clear that there weren't going to
- be formal claim construction disclosures up front.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, Tom, that is really, really
- disingenuous of you to claim because Vizio has offered
- dozens of times now to provide claim constructions.
- It is not going to do it unilaterally. Discovery is
- not a one-way street without any agreement from Sony

- to provide the same thing in return. That's how this
- $^2$  would need to work. We're not going to be agreeing to
- start providing you with all of these claim
- 4 construction contentions with no promise in return
- that you're going to be doing the same.
- So the idea that you served an
- <sup>7</sup> interrogatory and we've been withholding this
- information or any suggestion that we haven't been
- <sup>9</sup> willing to provide it is nonsense, because we have
- been begging for the parties to exchange this
- information. It's been Sony that has unilaterally
- decided that it's not going to provide this
- information during discovery.
- And secondly, I should correct something
- that you said about Sony not insisting on this stuff
- after the scheduling order went in place. Well,
- that's not true. There's letter correspondence from
- you folks after the scheduling order was in place
- asking for Vizio's claim constructions.
- MR. PEASE: Ryan, this is Tom again. My
- recollection there is there was one letter where
- somebody went through your interrogatory responses and
- simply identified those responses where there was no
- substantive information provided. So yes, someone did
- write a letter after the court adopted its schedule

- that mentioned your failure to answer that
- interrogatory. But other than that, my understanding
- is we had not insisted that you answer that
- interrogatory since then. And we have done nothing
- that was inconsistent with that position since then.
- 6 MR. McCRUM: I just want the record to be
- 7 clear. You said that after the scheduling order, Sony
- $^{8}$  made no effort to -- and the fact that there is a
- 9 letter out there which you now acknowledge exists, and
- it states that we did not answer that and requested
- that we provide an answer within 30 days. So I don't
- think you were clear on what actually transpired in
- the past on this issue.
- MR. PEASE: This is Tom again. I think the
- record is equally clear that we didn't raise that at
- the meet and confer and we didn't move to compel on
- <sup>17</sup> it.
- MR. McCRUM: For obvious reasons because Sony
- was not willing to provide that information itself.
- So anyway, what is it that you want from us in
- response to Interrogatory Number 3? You have our
- position. We feel like the claim construction, we are
- unable to provide further information on this. The
- next step needs to be claim construction, and that
- will much better inform the parties of the

- infringement and non infringement positions. And once
- that happens, then we can supplement the interrogatory
- 3 responses at that time.
- MR. PEASE: So am I correct, Ryan, Vizio has no
- 5 intention of supplementing its non infringement
- formal responses until there's been some sort of formal
- exchange in claim construction positions?
- MR. McCRUM: We are willing to supplement until
- either there's been an exchange of claim construction
- positions or the issue of claim construction has been
- resolved, or we are in possession of additional
- information that we learned through discovery that we
- think should be the subject of a supplementation.
- MR. PEASE: Let me ask you this. Is it your
- position that Sony based on this lack of resolution of
- the claim construction issue need not further
- supplement its infringement contentions until that's
- been resolved?
- MR. McCRUM: That's an issue that I haven't
- given any thought to. But I mean, the issue on Sony's
- infringement contentions is that absent claim
- construction, what you have given us just simply
- doesn't provide any level of any substance as to what
- exactly you are claiming in Vizio's product satisfies
- limitations. I mean, we have talked about that a

- number of times. The problem there is that you are
- relying on the same exact pieces of information from
- Vizio's documents and other areas -- well, Vizio's
- documents for every limitation, so there's no way for
- us to discern what exactly you're pointing to is
- 6 satisfying the limitations.
- Now, if you were to provide claim
- 8 construction, then maybe we would better understand
- 9 how it is that you're claiming that the same ten
- 10 features satisfy all limitations of the same claim.
- MR. PEASE: This is Tom again. I disagree with
- your characterization of the infringement contentions,
- but I think it's clear Vizio is not in the near future
- going to supplement its response to this interrogatory
- until there's been some sort of resolution of your
- motion seeking formal claims construction exchanges.
- 17 Is that correct.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I mean, if you want us to go
- back and put this information about the 182 patent --
- is that what you are looking for, that our prior
- representations that we made, those need to be
- included in our claim charts? Is that going to be
- <sup>23</sup> sufficient?
- MR. PEASE: No, it's not. Those just happen to
- be the examples that you chose to put in your

- discovery letter. What we want is for you to go back
- and provide that kind of detail with respect to all of
- the claims that have been asserted. We have given you
- 4 the infringement contention. Now the onus is on Vizio
- to say why it thinks it doesn't infringe. Your letter
- <sup>6</sup> gave one example that was very, very specific in terms
- of the operation of Vizio's products. Yes, we would
- like to see that information in the non infringement
- 9 chart with respect to the 182 patent, but we would
- like to see the same kind of information with the same
- level of detail in Vizio's responses with respect to
- the other asserted claims.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I will tell you what. We
- will go back, and I will see if there's anything else
- that we can add to our claim charts along those lines.
- I'm not making any promises, but I will let you know
- if we will be able to do that.
- MR. PEASE: When are you going to let us know
- 19 that?
- MR. McCRUM: I will let you know in standard
- operating procedure within a week from today.
- MR. KENNEDY: Why don't we move on to the next
- issue that was raised in the Rule 37 letter, and that
- is it appears to Sony that Vizio is withholding
- <sup>25</sup> critical documents regarding infringement. And the

- example provided in the letter is Vizio's statement
- about the histogram distribution once again. Sony has
- gone through Vizio's production and has been unable to
- locate any documents that describe that histogram
- 5 distribution that Vizio has referred to, and Sony has
- requested Vizio to provide the document control
- numbers that refer to that statement and has not been
- 8 able to do so.
- 9 MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum. Todd, we
- have told you, I don't know how many times now, we are
- not withholding documents on this issue. We have
- provided you with all documents that we have been able
- to locate. We will continue to search for responsive
- documents. To the extent we find any, we will produce
- them as soon as we can. But I don't know how many
- times I'm going to have to say this, but we are not
- withholding documents on that issue.
- MR. KENNEDY: Then where is the document about
- histogram distribution?
- MR. McCRUM: We never indicated that there was
- $^{21}$  a document on that.
- MR. KENNEDY: Where did Vizio get that
- information if not from a document?
- MR. McCRUM: Well, there's different ways to
- get information. I think you guys are smart enough to

- 1 know that. It doesn't have to come from a document.
- All I will tell you is that after Sony made
- allegations of infringement against Vizio, Vizio
- analyzed its products and obtained information
- <sup>5</sup> regarding the operation of its products, and we
- 6 provided that information to you in the context of --
- <sup>7</sup> the initial settlement discussions.
- And then we also when the issue of Rule
- 9 11 came up, we provided that information to you again
- when we had concerns about Sony's infringement
- allegations. And the purpose, which I have already
- mentioned, of doing that was to express our concern
- that despite advising Sony about why Vizio's products
- do not infringe, Sony went ahead and filed this
- lawsuit anyway without any apparent effort to confirm
- whether or not what Vizio told them was true or not.
- So again, as I have stated, we are not
- withholding documents that shed light on this issue.
- MR. PEASE: Ryan, a couple follow-up questions
- there. You say you got the information through
- sources as part of the settlement discussions and then
- provided it again as part of your alleged concerns
- about Sony's basis for bringing the suit. But we
- haven't seen the underlying documentation. And we
- haven't seen any supplement, for example, of Vizio's

- initial disclosures to identify the persons who are
- providing this information.
- And three, we have a real concern that
- despite Vizio's promise to produce documents in its
- possession, custody and control, we have a concern
- that Vizio has not asked AmTran, for example, for
- <sup>7</sup> relevant documents or asked the chip suppliers for
- 8 relevant documents.
- So I want to put it to you plainly now,
- has Vizio asked AmTran Technology to produce documents
- relating to the products that Vizio sells and that are
- accused of infringement in this action?
- MR. McCRUM: Well, let me ask you a question on
- that. I mean, is it your position that Vizio is
- obligated to produce documents from AmTran, which is a
- third party, a Taiwanese company not named in this
- 17 litigation?
- MR. PEASE: Absolutely. AmTran has
- participated in the settlement discussions. AmTran,
- we understand, is indemnifying Vizio. We suspect that
- AmTran is paying, for example, your fees. We don't
- know that, but we suspect it. AmTran is actively
- involved in this litigation. AmTran went out and
- bought patents to assert against Sony in response to
- Sony's assertion of patents against Vizio. AmTran

- makes the products that are accused of infringement.
- <sup>2</sup> Vizio's engineers talk to AmTran to get information
- from AmTran in the ordinary course of business. So
- 4 yes, in a nutshell, to the extent Vizio -- or to the
- extent our requests call for technical information
- 6 concerning the accused Vizio products and those Vizio
- products are manufactured by AmTran, yeah, we do think
- 8 Vizio does have a duty to go to AmTran and get that
- <sup>9</sup> documentation.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan. I am not going to
- sit here and argue with you about this. But do you
- have case law supporting this in the Central District
- of California or 9th circuit?
- MR. PEASE: I'm sure we have case law. I don't
- have it at hand.
- MR. McCRUM: Before we go down the road of
- agreeing to do something with regard to a third party
- not named in this litigation, a foreign company
- nonetheless, I want to be certain that this is
- something -- before we go to the burden and expense of
- doing this, I want to feel comfortable that this is
- something that Vizio does in fact have to do. And if
- you have got some case law on point, I would certainly
- be interested in looking at that.
- The other thing I want to note is the

- discovery requests are directed to Vizio and seek
- <sup>2</sup> Vizio's documents. AmTran is defined in those as a
- separate entity from Vizio. So the requests that
- 4 you've served do not even cover the documents that you
- 5 are seeking.
- But with that said, I am willing to
- discuss this with you to reach some type of reasonable
- 8 compromise, assuming the case law we're satisfied
- <sup>9</sup> supports Vizio having to take steps. And we are
- willing to discuss with you seeking some categories of
- documents from AmTran, the ones that we think and that
- I would assume you think are most relevant. And that
- is any technical type documents in AmTran's -- that
- 14 AmTran has.
- And for example, again, this is all based
- on the assumption that we ultimately agree or find
- that this is something that Vizio arguably -- at least
- arguably has an obligation to do. Okay? I'm not
- agreeing to doing any of this. I'm just putting this
- on the table in the event that we get that far.
- The types of documents that we would
- consider seeking from AmTran are technical documents
- including any user manuals, service manuals or
- engineering specifications that Vizio does not have.
- 25 And you know from our charts that we provided in

- 1 response to interrogatories that there are a few gaps
- with regard to user's manuals and service manuals.
- There may be gaps with regard to engineering
- 4 specifications. It's possible that AmTran has
- documents that could fill in those types of gaps.
- <sup>6</sup> And in addition, we could discuss asking
- AmTran for any additional technical documents they
- have relating to the areas of technology here, for
- example, gamma correction, the on-screen displays,
- incription, closed captioning, et cetera. But we do
- not think that we -- well, right now we don't think
- we're obligated to get any of this stuff. But if we
- do, we certainly are not going to AmTran and asking
- them for the full scope of documents that are
- requested by Sony's very broad document request. You
- know, things like their financial information and
- their marketing materials and other non-technical
- documents, if those are the things that you're going
- to be pushing us on, then I don't think we have much
- of a hope of resolving this.
- MR. KLIVANS: Ryan, this is Peter. You didn't
- mention source code. Would source code fall into the
- category of documents you were just describing?
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I think that source code
- would be considered -- would fall into that category

- of technical documents, to the extent that AmTran has
- source code. I have my serious doubts about that.
- But I mean, is this something you're willing to do?
- <sup>4</sup> As the first step, I want to feel comfortable that
- this is something that you can properly request Vizio
- to do and assuming that's the case, then that would be
- <sup>7</sup> the route that we would propose on this.
- MR. KLIVANS: Ryan, this is Peter again. If we
- 9 were able to provide you such case law later today,
- can you give us an answer by tomorrow whether you
- would be going to AmTran?
- MR. McCRUM: I could try. But, you know --
- MR. KLIVANS: Because this is something that we
- $^{14}$  have talked about quite a bit over many weeks. It
- sounds like you're being a bit flexible, and there
- might be room for agreement, but we don't want to
- delay any longer because time is running short.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I understand that. I can't
- promise you, Peter, but I will make every effort to
- get some type of answer for you tomorrow. That is
- 21 pretty quick given that it's -- what time it is my
- time right now, but it's getting late in the day
- already today, but we will certainly try.
- MR. KLIVANS: Tom, did you want to add
- <sup>25</sup> anything?

- MR. PEASE: No. I think the position is clear.
- Just in terms of -- you asked about the scope. We'll
- have to think about this off line, but I don't think
- we're seeking every document in AmTran's possession
- <sup>5</sup> like financial documents and the like. I think, like
- <sup>6</sup> you said, we are interested in technical documentation
- but not limited to user manuals and service manuals
- but also the documentation including source code, the
- firmware, drivers, archaeal code, to the extent that's
- relevant, relating to this issues presented by the
- 11 Sony patent suit.
- MR. McCRUM: Okay. Let us -- we're not putting
- any limitation on the technical documents at this
- point to user manuals or service manuals. We're
- willing to discuss the possibility of going and
- getting the technical documents relating to the
- technology at issue in this case.
- MR. KENNEDY: This is Todd. Not that we're
- backtracking too much, but I feel like I didn't get a
- straight answer about where Vizio's statement
- regarding the histogram distribution came from.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I am not sure that I need to
- give you an answer to that question. The issues that
- are on the table today relate to Vizio's document
- production and your claims that we have not produced

- documents that you think we have. And what I am
- telling you is that we have produced everything we
- have on that issue. Vizio's pre-filing investigation,
- 4 pre-complaint work I don't think is a proper subject
- <sup>5</sup> of this call.
- MR. KENNEDY: So right now you're refusing to
- disclose to Sony where Vizio's statement regarding
- 8 histogram distribution is supported and documents or
- 9 where Vizio obtained that information?
- MR. McCRUM: I don't think that's a proper
- subject of our meet and confer today.
- MR. KENNEDY: Why don't we move on to the next
- topic in the letter which is Sony's concern that Vizio
- is withholding communications that it has had with
- third parties regarding infringement. There is one
- example that is pointed out in the letter, and that is
- that in Vizio's April 22, 2009 response to Sony's
- 18 Interrogatory Number 16, Vizio stated that it had
- instructed its original equipment manufacturers to not
- incorporate transparency features with respect to
- on-screen displays. Vizio has not produced any such
- correspondence in this litigation as far as Sony can
- $^{23}$  tell.
- $^{24}$  Is that correct.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum. You know,

- 1 I'm not sure -- I can't say we have or have not. But
- our understanding right now, Todd, is that those
- instructions or that correspondence relating to those
- instructions was provided orally. Nevertheless, given
- 5 your letter, we will go back and we will continue to
- search records and files and certainly to the extent
- <sup>7</sup> that we -- there is any correspondence that we find in
- 8 our searches on this topic, we will produce it.
- It's going to get us into another issue
- because we have got this whole issue about e-mail
- correspondence and the protocol for producing that.
- And what I can tell you is that our understanding of
- that agreement, and I think you folks have at least a
- $^{14}$  similar if not the same understanding is that the
- parties are not going to do any burdensome searches of
- e-mail databases. But to the extent that the e-mails
- are located through searchs of other files, then the
- parties are not going to be withholding those.
- So in accordance with that agreement, we
- have not been conducting extensive searches of e-mail
- databases, and we have not uncovered any
- communications on this topic through our other
- searches.
- MR. KLIVANS: Ryan, this is Peter. That's not
- entirely inaccurate what you just said, but I think

- you're leaving out something important though, which I
- mentioned in my letter a few days ago in that if the
- e-mails are already in the possession of counsel, of
- 4 yourselves, that doesn't entail a burdensome
- <sup>5</sup> electronic searches by anyone. Those need to be
- 6 produced. If you have e-mails, say, between you and
- <sup>7</sup> AmTran, which you described in this very call is a
- 8 third party, those need to be not logged but actually
- 9 produced to us even if they're post-complaint since
- it's Vizio who wants third party communications
- post-complaint.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan again. We're getting
- onto another topic here, and I mean, as I think Tom
- has already pointed out, and you should know, AmTran
- is a client of Jones Day. And therefore,
- communications between Jones Day and AmTran are
- privileged documents.
- MR. KLIVANS: Is AmTran indemnifying Vizio in
- 19 this matter?
- MR. McCRUM: I'm not going to comment on that
- right now. I'm not sure I am even in the position to.
- But further to my point, Vizio is of the position that
- given its joint representation of Vizio and AmTran and
- the common interests that applies to both in this
- litigation, that any post-complaint communications

- between Jones Day and AmTran are not only privileged
- clearly, but should be treated in the same way that
- communications between, for example, your Quinn
- 4 Emanuel and Sony should be treated and need not be
- <sup>5</sup> logged.
- 6 MR. KLIVANS: Is AmTran a client with respect
- <sup>7</sup> to these patents in this matter?
- MR. McCRUM: Yes. It's my understanding that
- 9 is true, and I don't want to go out and say anything
- for sure about our technical representation of these
- parties on a transcribed record without looking into
- all the details of that myself. But I believe that to
- be the case, Peter. But I would have to do further
- investigation to know exactly the full scope of our
- representation of AmTran.
- MR. KLIVANS: Given what you said, maybe we can
- put aside the post-complaint issue. In the log that
- you mentioned in the letter of, I think it was the
- 19 17th that you were preparing, would that include
- pre-complaint communications?
- MR. McCRUM: Well, this is Ryan again. You
- $^{22}$  know we -- I think we need to talk about that. I
- wanted to ask you if that's what you folks are
- planning. I mean, we're open to doing this however
- the parties agree. But I want to make sure we're all

- doing the same thing. I mean, Sony and Quinn Emanuel,
- you are going to be logging all of Quin Emanuel's
- pre-complaint communications including e-mails that
- <sup>4</sup> are already in your possession between Sony and Quinn
- 5 Emanuel and any other pre-complaint communications?
- 6 Because that seems to be what you're suggesting need
- <sup>7</sup> to happen. And if that's what you are suggesting and
- $^8$  we agree, then we would do that. But I don't know
- <sup>9</sup> that the parties have reached an agreement. Is that
- the agreement?
- MR. KLIVANS: I think we can agree that the
- parties would do the same thing, and since this wasn't
- a topic today, maybe we should put it off. But that
- being said, we have and we have produced an enormous
- log to you. Do you have any time frame -- putting
- aside the specific issue, just the log in general, do
- you have any time frame maybe you can give us that we
- might expect a log from you guys?
- MR. McCRUM: I don't know, Peter, exactly when.
- I can tell you that we have done a good amount of work
- on it. We are making progress on it. I have to talk
- to our people about when it will be complete. I don't
- know that it was an issue on your agenda for your meet
- and confer. I don't have it in my notes as an issue.
- MR. KLIVANS: It wasn't specifically, except

- for the fact that you raised it in your letter of the
- <sup>2</sup> 17th. It didn't sort of relate to the other topic.
- But maybe you could check and get back to us in a week
- on when you might expect that?
- MR. McCRUM: Yeah. I will check into it and
- <sup>6</sup> get back to you guys.
- MR. KLIVANS: And certainly Sony is doing a
- 8 rolling log asking to produce documents that we
- <sup>9</sup> supplement, and we wouldn't expect Vizio to do
- anything differently. We would note our experience
- with Judge Olguin is that he thinks parties should do
- rolling logs that are done as documents are produced.
- Obviously, he hasn't ruled on anything in this
- specific matter, but that's not controlling it in this
- matter. But that's our experience with him.
- MR. McCRUM: Okay. Why don't you let us know
- what your position is and what your proposal is on
- pre-complaint communications between outside counsel
- and our respective clients, in other words, Quinn
- Emanuel and Sony and Jones Day and Vizio and AmTran.
- Because that's going to have an impact on our log and
- how we're going to proceed.
- MR. KLIVANS: We will let you know especially
- because since you described AmTran as a client that
- helpful information that we reach agreement on this.

- MR. McCRUM: Okay. I know we got way off on
- tangents there, Todd, so I don't know where you were.
- MR. KENNEDY: I think you answered by saying
- 4 that all the communications with the original
- <sup>5</sup> equipment manufacturers were oral. Is that correct?
- 6 Every single communication that Vizio has had with its
- original equipment manufacturers instructing them to
- 8 not include transparency features was an oral
- 9 communication?
- MR. McCRUM: That is our standing. Steve, when
- we inquired about that, that's the answer we got, or
- do we have more information on that?
- MR. CORR: This is Steve Corr. Yeah, Ryan, I
- would say -- and Todd, to answer your question
- directly, we are aware of oral communications, but we
- are continuing to search to be sure that that is the
- complete extent of the communication. So to the
- extent we're -- we have -- we have received
- information about this, it has been characterized as
- oral communications. But I'm not willing to say that
- with complete certainty there are no written
- communications. I just -- we have been unable to
- locate any communications of that nature.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan. And I want to
- further add to that that this request is asking us to

- do something that could arguably be beyond the scope
- of what our obligations are under the agreement for
- e-mails. I mean, we certainly have not located these
- 4 communications in our search of non e-mail database
- <sup>5</sup> files. And I am not going to commit here on the phone
- today that we are going to go out and start searching
- <sup>7</sup> for -- searching e-mail databases for this document.
- $^{8}$  I mean, I think that would totally undermine the
- <sup>9</sup> agreement that the parties are trying to reach. If we
- agree we don't have to do that and then the parties
- can come in and say, well, we want these specific
- e-mail communications, go search for it, then that
- would basically eviscerate that agreement. So I want
- to make sure that we're clear on what our obligations
- are here.
- MR. KENNEDY: This is Todd. I know I am going
- back to Interrogatory Number 3 yet again, but I feel
- like we're not making any progress on this
- interrogatory. Sitting here right now Sony has no
- idea whether Vizio has analyzed a document that
- supports this assertion about the histogram
- distribution. Is there a document that supports
- Vizio's assertion that Vizio has reviewed?
- MR. McCRUM: If we had a document, Todd, in our
- possession, custody or control, we would have produced

- it. I don't know what else to say about this.
- MR. KENNEDY: Have you produced such a
- 3 document?
- 4 MR. McCRUM: No, we have not produced it
- because we don't have it, and I'm not sure one even
- 6 exists.
- 7 MR. KENNEDY: I don't understand how Vizio
- 8 could have made this representation about non
- infringement, this specific factual representation,
- unless it had such a document in its possession,
- 11 custody or control.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I don't even know how to
- respond to that other than I'm sorry that you don't
- $^{14}$  understand that. That's the way it is.
- MR. KENNEDY: I don't understand why you can't
- just tell us where you got that information.
- MR. McCRUM: Because it's not something that
- was -- is the proper subject of this meet and confer,
- nor do I necessarily believe that you've sent us part
- of a discovery request that is tabled for today and
- that we are obligated to provide.
- MR. KENNEDY: Ryan, I absolutely disagree that
- that's not a proper subject of the meet and confer
- today. The meet and confer topic is about the
- histogram distribution document in particular. It's

obvious that Vizio has either reviewed a document itself or has instructed a third party to review a document, and yet you're refusing to disclose where that information came from, and you're trying to use Local Rule 37 in such a way as to avoid the topic. MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan. I am not avoiding the topic, Todd. The discussion and meet and confer is about alleged deficiencies in Vizio's document production. You have raised a number of concerns 10 about documents that you think are in our possession, 11 custody and/or control, and that's what we are talking 12 about today. And I have told you we don't have those 13 documents. We produced everything that we had in our possession, custody and control on that issue. We are 15 not going to be talking about Vizio's pre-complaint 16 work and investigations. It's not the proper subject 17 of this call, and I'm not going to talk about it 18 anymore. 19 MR. KENNEDY: Let's go on to a different issue 20 Vizio has produced some engineering 21 specification documents, and in the letter, one of 22 those documents is identified as production Number 23 V43780 through 818. But it appears that Vizio has not 24 produced such documents for each of these accused 25 televisions. Is that because Vizio does not have

- documents for each of these accused televisions?
- MR. McCRUM: You know, I don't know that we
- don't have them for -- I suspect we don't have them
- for each of these televisions. But I believe we are
- making a production today that includes product
- <sup>6</sup> specifications.
- Steve, you might be able to still
- 8 elaborate on that. Is that right?
- 9 MR. CORR: Yeah. This is Steve Corr. I
- believe -- I don't know if the production is going out
- today. It may go out tomorrow. And it does include
- additional technical documentation. But this point in
- this meet and confer today presumes that all those
- documents either exist or that Vizio has all those
- documents.
- And so to the extent those types of
- documents are within the possession, custody or
- control of Vizio, they have either been produced or
- they're going to be produced. But the idea that it's
- somehow deficient to not produce something that they
- don't have does not make a lot of sense to me.
- MR. KENNEDY: I just wanted to confirm that
- Vizio doesn't have such documents and that Vizio was
- in fact making every effort to uncover documents in
- its possession, custody or control. Not to beat a

dead horse, but let's go on the next issue which is
similar and that involves the structure and operation
of the scalars, s-c-a-l-a-r-s, and microprocessors of
Vizio's televisions. It appears that Vizio has not
produced documents regarding each of those scalars or
microprocessors.

MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum. You know, this is basically the same issue here, Todd. We're producing everything we have, and the fact of the matter is Vizio just does not have much of anything regarding the function, structure and operation of these scalars and microprocessors. I know in your letter you find that extremely hard to believe, but it's true. That information, as we have told you in the past, is much more likely to be in the hands of our chip suppliers, most notably, Media Tek, and this is where we would suggest that you get this information from.

MR. KENNEDY: Let's go on to the last issue in the letter, which is Vizio's failure to produce any source code. In our last meet and confer you said Vizio does not have any source code. And as we pointed out in the Local Rule 37 letter, Vizio's document production indicated otherwise. There is a document showing that firmware was received by Vizio

- from a third party and yet we haven't seen any of that
- <sup>2</sup> firmware.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan McCrum. We stand by
- our representation in prior meet and confers that
- <sup>5</sup> Vizio does not have source code. Given the demands
- that you have made recently, we are, as we always do
- after we get these demands, go back and double, triple
- $^8$  check that is the case. I fully expect that we are
- <sup>9</sup> going to confirm, as we already have and determined
- that Vizio does not have source code.
- Now, with regard to your claim that Vizio
- produced, quote, a number of documents confirming that
- it does possess source code, the document that you
- identified, Todd, and even mentioned source code or
- relate to source code, it requests -- and it doesn't
- indicate it was ever received. It requests firmware,
- and firmware is something completely different than
- source code.
- MR. KENNEDY: Ryan, this is Todd. Actually,
- the definition of source code in the interrogatory
- request that we are talking about specifically
- includes firmware. So when I say "source code" I am
- referring also to firmware.
- MS. BELVILLE: Ryan, I believe I can send you a
- document that confirms that it was received by

- <sup>1</sup> Mr. Lowe.
- MR. CORR: This is Steve Corr. Ryan, can I
- jump in here?
- $^4$  MR. McCRUM: Sure.
- MR. CORR: To the extent that -- was that
- 6 Heather who was just on?
- MS. BELVILLE: Correct.
- MR. CORR: So to the extent if we do have these
- 9 materials, and I'm not aware that we do, if you would
- send me the materials that you have that give you that
- impression, that would help me in my efforts to do
- what Ryan just talked about, the triple and quadruple
- check on this issue.
- MR. McCRUM: This is Ryan. You represent in
- your letter, Todd, that there are a number of
- documents confirming this, and you have only
- identified one, so can you send me a list of the other
- documents that you're talking about for the reason
- 19 Steve just suggested?
- MR. KENNEDY: Absolutely.
- MR. McCRUM: And that will help us to figure
- out if we have any of this stuff where it would be.
- Because we don't believe that we do have any of this.
- Now, on the issue of -- I understand that
- your definition of source code included firmware, but,

- you know, your letters refer only to source code, and
- $^{2}$  the fact is they are different things. I mean,
- firmware is specifically an executable file in binary
- form and just consists of a bunch of ones and zeros.
- <sup>5</sup> It really has no value.
- Now, if you want that stuff and we have
- it, which is doubtful, you know, we can go ahead and
- see if we can get that produced. But it's really not
- 9 relevant to any issue in this case. It's just useless
- information.
- The e-mail that you're pointing to is
- from five years ago from an individual who no longer
- even works at Vizio and it's requesting firmware. And
- $^{14}$  I disagree strongly with your representation that such
- an e-mail confirms that Vizio currently has source
- code. So we'll go back. We will see if there's
- source code or firmware. Like I said, I don't expect
- that we are going to find -- particularly on the
- source code front we're going to find anything. And
- we'll go back and look to see whether there's any
- firmware. But I want to make sure you actually want
- that before we go ahead and produce it.
- MR. KENNEDY: Sony does want firmware. And
- just to be clear, one of the reasons is that my
- understanding is that often this firmware is included

- on a USB stick that has been uploaded to the
- television. And it's unclear what other files might
- be on such a USB stick. And in addition, the firmware
- is relevant because presumably there would be a date
- <sup>5</sup> associated with that firmware update. And obviously,
- the time at which Vizio is updating the functionality
- of its televisions is relevant to damages and
- 8 infringement.
- 9 MR. McCRUM: Okay. We'll go back to look and
- see on both of these, but I wouldn't get your hopes up
- on what we're going to find. But we'll certainly go
- back and double and triple check on that. But like I
- said, it will be very helpful it we get the other
- documents you're referring to in your letter.
- MR. KENNEDY: We can certainly send those to
- you this week.
- MR. McCRUM: Okay. Great.
- MR. KENNEDY: Does anybody else have anything
- 19 from the Sony side? I know that Vizio would like to
- talk about limiting the number of asserted claims.
- MR. MILLER: I think that we're all done with
- what we have to say, given the silence on the line.
- MR. KENNEDY: Why don't we talk about asserting
- claims. Ryan, if you would like to start that out.
- MR. McCRUM: Sure. This is Ryan again. I

- don't have a whole lot else to say. We put our
- proposal on the table that Vizio would like Sony to
- limit the number of asserted claims to three or less
- 4 per patent by September 1. And given the schedule
- that is in place in this litigation, this is something
- that we feel needs to be addressed very soon. There's
- not a whole lot of time left for discovery. To the
- 8 extent that we can reach an agreement on experts, we
- <sup>9</sup> want to make sure that our experts are focusing on the
- claims that are actually going to be at issue at
- trial. And so we need to resolve this. And I think I
- had them decide in my letter of correspondence and our
- meet and confer last week that we would like to
- resolve this issue this week and get an answer from
- Sony as to whether it would be willing to limit its
- claims to three per patent by September 1.
- MR. KENNEDY: This is Todd. Sony is certainly
- willing to discuss limiting the number of asserted
- 19 claims. But just an initial matter, is Vizio willing
- to work with Sony in an effort to identify
- representative accused products?
- MR. McCRUM: Well, this is the first time I
- have heard of that. I can't say we're not unwilling
- to think about that, but what's your proposal?
- MR. KENNEDY: I mean, sitting here right now I

don't think we have a specific proposal, especially

because we haven't had an opportunity to inspect any

of Vizio's products. The way that this typically

works, and correct me if I am wrong, is that the

parties would develop an understanding of how the

6 products as a whole work and would then be in a

position to determine which of those products could

serve as a representative product. I mean, at this

time we haven't been able to inspect Vizio's

televisions, so it may be difficult right now to

identify representative products. But it is certainly

something that we're interested in.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. McCRUM: Well, we're happy to talk about that, Todd, at another time. And if you have got a reasonable proposal on the table, then we would be willing to consider it. But I don't think that that needs to be considered in conjunction with limiting the number of claims. Judge Klausner has done this in the past at earlier stages in litigation and limited it to a fewer number of claim terms and recognizes the benefit of doing this. So, you know, we really can't afford to go much longer without knowing what claims are ultimately going to be at issue. So we're willing to talk about representative products. And if you want to propose a time to do that and make a specific

- proposal, we're happy to consider it. But for now, we
- need to focus on the issue that we had raised and that
- $^3$  we need to get an answer on.
- $^4$  MR. KENNEDY: I think what I am saying is that
- in order for Sony to agree to limit its claims, it
- 6 would need to first get a better idea of how Vizio's
- televisions -- each of Vizio's specific television
- 8 models work. And then at that point Sony would not
- only be able to limit the number of its asserted
- claims, but it would also be able to work with Vizio
- to identify representative products. I certainly
- can't tell you right now that Sony is willing to by
- September 1st pick claims at X, Y and Z.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, that's the question that we
- put on the table and that we wanted to know this week,
- so, you know, all I can say on that is we need to
- resolve this. And if we can't get an answer on it
- this week, then we're going to have to seek relief
- 19 from the court.
- MR. KENNEDY: What kind of answer do you want
- this week? Do you want us to actually identify the
- claims that are going to be asserted and then also
- reach an agreement about representative product?
- What -- how much progress do you expect us to be able
- to make by the end of the week?

1 MR. McCRUM: Well, I mean, you have had some 2 time to think about it, and our proposal isn't by the end of this week for you to identify your three claims. It's to tell us whether you will agree to limit the number of asserted claims to three per patent by September 1. So you would have more time than the end of the week to figure that out, and --MR. KENNEDY: I don't understand why three is the magic number here. What if we wanted to drop one 10 patent from the lawsuit and assert six claims from 11 another patent? I don't think we can tell you right 12 now that we're willing to limit it to three claims per 13 ten patents. 14 MR. McCRUM: Okay. Well, you know, we were

MR. McCRUM: Okay. Well, you know, we were hopeful that if you had an alternative proposal, we would hear from it. If you wanted to limit it to 30 claims, three per patent or a total of 20 by a certain date regardless of where they came from, you know, we would consider that. But you haven't put any other proposal on the table.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KENNEDY: I think what probably makes sense here is for us to both talk to our respective clients and determine how far we're willing to go in terms of limiting not only the asserted claims but also coming up with a list of representative products, and then we

- $^{1}$  can just talk off line next week about it, Wednesday,
- or something like that, and see what we can put
- together. I don't think we're going to be able to
- 4 give you an answer right here on the phone and
- 5 certainly not by tomorrow.
- But Sony is definitely open to the idea
- of limiting the number of asserted claims, and it
- 8 sounds like Vizio is open to the idea of limiting or
- <sup>9</sup> coming up with a list of representative products.
- MR. McCRUM: All right. Well, I don't know
- what your proposal is on representative products, but
- we would like to have an answer -- we would like to
- have this resolved -- we would like to have it
- resolved this week. That was our initial proposal.
- But if you would like to talk about it next week and
- maybe make a proposal to us on your representative
- products by Monday, then we can talk about this and
- see if we can reach an agreement by Tuesday or
- Wednesday.
- And if we can't -- you know, I'm not
- trying to make undue threats here. I'm just telling
- you this is a very serious and urgent matter that we
- want to address now as it needs to be addressed now.
- 24 And if we can't resolve it, given the way the time it
- takes to get these issues before the court and address

- them, we can't afford to wait. We have got a very,
- very fast schedule in this litigation and so we've got
- 3 to act quickly on these types of things. So if we
- 4 can't reach something by next Wednesday -- that's the
- $^{5}$  drop-dead deadline on this as far as Vizio is
- 6 concerned -- we need to raise the issue with Judge
- <sup>7</sup> Klausner.
- MR. KENNEDY: Well, I think that Sony will be
- <sup>9</sup> in a position to sometime early next week send Vizio
- some sort of proposal regarding limitations of claims
- and also an identification of representative products.
- I don't know how specific we can be at this point
- given that we haven't had an opportunity to inspect
- $^{14}$  Vizio's televisions, but we can certainly be as
- specific as we can.
- MR. McCRUM: Well, I mean, not to go off on a
- tangent here, but you have got Vizio's televisions
- that are on the market currently available and have
- been available since you have filed this suit.
- There's no reason why -- and in fact, Sony should have
- been looking at those products. And I think the case
- law in this issue indicates that that is in fact the
- case and that you don't have to have -- get this far
- along in the litigation before it's proper to make
- these types of calls. If you're suggesting that we

- need to wait until your inspection of our products is
- complete, then we might as well end the discussions
- <sup>3</sup> right now.
- 4 MR. KENNEDY: That's not what I am representing
- <sup>5</sup> right now. I don't know what conclusion we're going
- to reach after we talk with our client about this.
- But Sony agreed that it's in both parties' interest to
- 8 come up with some kind of an agreement, but that
- 9 agreement would have to include an identification of
- certain representative products. And the fact that we
- have not been able to inspect all of the 160-plus
- accused products makes it very difficult for us to be
- able to have an idea about which of those products is
- $^{14}$  going to serve as a good representative product. So
- we'll do the best that we can, and we'll get back to
- you early next week, say Monday or Tuesday.
- MR. McCRUM: Okay. And we'll plan on meeting
- on Wednesday?
- MR. KENNEDY: That sounds good.
- MR. McCRUM: Okay.
- MR. KENNEDY: I think. Is that good for
- everyone?
- MR. PEASE: I think that works. I have to
- check a couple things, but that should work for me.
- MR. McCRUM: Tom, are you going to be at the

```
Page 55
 1
     ENE next week?
 2
            MR. PEASE: I don't know yet. It's still up in
     the air. How about you?
            MR. McCRUM: I'm not going to be there, but
     that's next Wednesday.
            MR. MILLER: Guys, I hate to interrupt the
     conversation when we're finally being cordial, but if
     that's the case, I think we might as well go ahead and
     close the record right now because we have some
10
     off-the-record items to discuss too.
11
     ///
12
     ///
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Page 56
1	I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
2	Reporter of the State of California, do hereby
3	certify:
4	That the foregoing proceedings were taken
5	before me at the time and place herein set forth; that
6	any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to
7	testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the
8	proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand
9	which was thereafter transcribed under my direction;
10	that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the
11	testimony given.
12	Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the
13	original transcript of a deposition in a Federal Case,
14	before completion of the proceedings, review of the
15	<pre>transcript {      } was {      } was not requested.</pre>
16	I further certify I am neither financially
17	interested in the action nor a relative or employee of
18	any attorney or party to this action.
19	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date
20	subscribed my name.
21	
22	Dated:
23	
24	
25	JILL GLANTZ CSR No. 11341

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

## **EXHIBIT B**

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	SA CV 08-0	SA CV 08-01135-RGK (FMOx)			Date	April 6, 2009
Title	SONY CORPORATION v. VIZIO, INC.					
Present: The Honorable		R. GARY KLAU	JSNER, UNITED	STATES DIS	STRIC	T JUDGE
Sharon L. Williams		ns	Lynne Nicholson			N/A
I	Deputy Clerk		Court Reporter / Recorder		Tape No.	
A	ttorneys Prese	ent for Plaintiffs:		Attorneys Present for Defendants:		
Edward De Franco		Kevin McBride James Wamsley, III				
Proceedin	gs: S	CHEDULING CO	ONFERENCE			
Case following da		t and counsel conf	er. The Schedulin	ng Conference	is hel	d. The Court sets the
Jury Trial (Est. 10-20 days): Pretrial Conference: Motion Cut-Off (last day to file): Discovery Cut-Off:			Ja N	January 26, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. January 10, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. November 10, 2009 November 1, 2009		
IT IS	SO ORDER	ED.				
						: 12
			Initi	als of Preparer	slw	1

## **EXHIBIT C**

1	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIV	'ER				
2	& HEDGES, LLP Kevin P.B. Johnson (Bar No. 177129)					
3	kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560					
4	Redwood Shores, California 94065-2139   Telephone: (650) 801-5000	•				
5	Facsimile: (650) 801-5100					
6	Edward J. DeFranco (Bar No. 165596) eddefranco@quinnemanuel.com 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor					
7	New York, New York 10010					
8	Telephone: (212) 849-7000  Facsimile: (212) 849-7100					
9	Steven M. Anderson (Bar No. 144014)					
10	steveneanderson@quinnemanuel.com 865 S. Figueroa St. 10th Floor					
11	Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 443-3000					
12	Facsimile: (213) 443-3100					
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff Sony Corporation					
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
15	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
16	WESTERN DIVISION					
17	SONY CORPORATION, A Japanese	CASE NO. SA CV08-01135-RGK (FMOx)				
18	corporation,					
19	Plaintiff,	SONY'S FIRST SET OF				
20	i idilitii,	REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION   TO VIZIO				
21	VS.					
22	VIZIO, Inc.,					
23	Defendant.					
24	Defendant.					
25		-				
26						
27						
28						

SONY'S FIRST SET OF RFPs

### 

25 |

### **SONY'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Sony Corporation requests that Defendant Vizio, Inc. produce for inspection and copying within thirty (30) days of service of these requests the Documents and things described herein within Vizio's possession, custody or control, at the offices of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP, 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Redwood Shores, California 94025, or at a place and time as may be agreed to by counsel.

### **DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**

Each request in Sony's First Set of Requests for Production is subject to and incorporates the following definitions and instructions as used herein:

1. "Vizio Product" means any product manufactured, sold, offered for sale, or distributed in, and/or imported into, the United States by Vizio since October 10, 2002 that by itself or in combination with any other product, device, or instrumentality is capable of displaying digital video signals, data or information. The term shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following Vizio products: GV42L, GV42L FHDTV10A, GV42L HDTV, GV42L10A, GV42LF, GV46L FHDTV20A, GV46L HDTV, GV47L FHDTV20A, GV42LF, GV46L FHDTV10A, HDX 20L, JV50P HDTV10A, L15, L20, L30, L30e, L30WGEe, L30WGU, L32 HDTV, L37, L37HDTV, L42, L42 HDTV, L6, P4, P42, P42 ED, P42 HD, P42 HDTV, P46, P50 HDM, P50 HDTV20A, SV420XVT, SV420XVT 1A, SV470XVT, SV470XVT1A, V022L, VA19L HDTV10T, VA22LF HDTV10T, VA26L HDTV10T, VECO320L, VF550XVT, VF550XVT 1A, VM60P, VM60P HDTV, VO22L FHDTV10A, VO22LF, VO32L, VO32L HDTV10A, VO37L, VO37L HDTV10A, VO42L, VO42L FHDTV10A, VO47L FHDTV10A, VOJ320F, VOJ320F1A, VOJ370, VOJ370F, VOJ370F, VP322, VP322 HDTV10A, VP42,

1	VP
2	20.
3	VS
4	VĮ
5	FH
6	10.
7	VV
8	Ш
9	VV
10	VV
11	V۶
12	20.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

16 Product.

42 HDTV, VP422, VP422 HDTV10A, VP423 HDTV10A, VP50 10A, VP50 A, VP50 HDTV20A, VP503 HDTV10A, VP504 FHDTV10A, VP505XVT1A, 370, VS420LF, VS420LF1A, VS42L 10A, VS42L FHDTV10A, VS42LF, J32L, VU32L HDTV10A, VU37L HDTV10A, VU42L 10A, VU42L IDTV10A, VU42LF, VW22L HDTV10T, VW26L, VW26L HDTV10F, VW32L A, VW32L 30A, VW32L HDTV10A, VW32L HDTV30A, VW37L 10A, W37L 20A, VW37L 30A, VW37L 40A, VW37L HDTV10A, VW37L DTV30A, VW37L HDTV40A, VW42L, VW42L 10A, VW42L FHDTV10A, V42L HDTV10A, VW42LF, VW46L FHDTV10A, VW46L20A, VW46LF, W47L 10A, VW47L FHDTV10A, VW47LF, VX20L, VX20L 20A, VX32L, K32L 20A, VX32L HDTV , VX32L HDTV20A, VX37L, VX37L 10A, VX37L A, VX37L HDTV, VX37L HDTV10A, VX37L HDTV20A, VX42L, VX42L 10A, VX42L HDTV10A, VX52L 10A, VX52L FHDTV10A, VX52LF, VXW20L, 13 VXW20L 10A, VMM26, and VMM26 F201 LCD. In the event that any of Vizio's 14

"Related Vizio Products" means any device manufactured, sold, 2. offered for sale, or distributed in, and/or imported into, the United States by Vizio that is capable of being connected to or used with any of the Vizio Products. The term shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following Vizio products: Bravo D1, Bravo D2, Bravo HD1, VR1, VR2, VR3, VUR2, VUR5, VUR6, and VUR8.

products have any versions, each version shall be considered a separate Vizio

- "626 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 5,434,626, entitled "Display 3. Apparatus Displaying Operation Menu."
- "577 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 5,583,577, entitled "Caption Data Coding/Decoding Systems And Methods That Includes Key Data Indicating Intermediate Levels Of Attenuation In The Vicinity Of The Caption."

27

26

- 5. "'542 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 5,684,542, entitled "Video Subtitle Processing System."
- 6. "847 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 5,731,847, entitled "Subtitle Encoding/Decoding Method and Apparatus."
- 7. "373 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 5,751,373, entitled "Television function selection method, television receiver and remote commander for television receiver."
- 8. "614 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 6,111,614, entitled "Method And Apparatus For Displaying An Electronic Menu Having Components With Differing Levels Of Transparency."
- 9. "'055 patent" means U.S. Patent No. RE38,055, entitled "Video Data Bus Communication System and Method."
- 10. "'468 patent" means U.S. Patent Re-issue No. 40,468, entitled "Video Data Bus Communication System and Method."
- 11. "182 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 6,778,182, entitled "Display Device."
- 12. "472 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 6,661,472, entitled "Channel selection in digital television."
- 13. "Patents-in-suit" means the '626 patent, the '577 patent, the '542 patent, the '847 patent, the '373 patent, the '614 patent, the '055 patent, the '468 patent, the '182 patent, the '472 patent, and any other patent that Sony may later assert in this action that Vizio infringes.
- 14. "Affirmative Defense" shall refer to each defense asserted by Vizio relating to Sony's claims against Vizio, including, without limitation, any defenses enumerated in Vizio's Answer, filed January 26, 2009, or any amendments or supplements thereto.

- "Communication" or "Communications" shall mean, without 15. limitation, any transmittal, conveyance or exchange of a word, statement, fact, thing, idea, Document, instruction, information, demand, question or other information by any medium, whether by written, oral or other means, including but not limited to electronic communications and electronic mail.
- "Document" or "Documents" shall have the broadest meaning ascribed 16. to it by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34 and Federal Rule of Evidence 1001. The term shall include within its meaning, by way of example and not limitation, any and all accounts, analyses, books, CDs, calendars, commercial paper, communications, correspondence, DVDs, e-mail, films, financial statements, floppy disks, hard disks, inter-office memoranda, invoices, ledgers, letters, licenses, logs, memoranda, microfilms, minutes, notes, notes of conversations, notes of meetings, 13 notes of telephone calls, office communications, photographs, printouts, recordings of conversations (whether written or electronic), reports, schedules, storage tape, task lists, telegrams, telephone bills, videotapes or other video recordings, and any differing versions of the foregoing whether denominated formal, informal or otherwise, as well as copies of the foregoing which differ from the original in any way, including handwritten notations or other written or printed matter. The foregoing specifically includes information stored electronically, whether in a computer database or otherwise, regardless of whether such documents are presently in documentary form or not. A draft or non-identical copy of a Document is a separate Document within the meaning of this term.
  - "Identify" when used in reference to: 17.
  - An individual, means to state his or her full name, present or last (1)known residential and business addresses, present or last known position and business affiliation, and if applicable, history of employment of that individual;

25

26

- (2) A firm, partnership, corporation, proprietorship, joint venture, association, or other organization or entity, means to state its full name, present or last known address and place of incorporation or formation and to identify each agent that acted for it with respect to the matters relating to the request or answer;
- (3) A document, means to state the date, title, if any, subject matter, each author, each addressee or recipient if practicable, and otherwise a general description of the persons to whom the writing was distributed, the production number, and the type of document, *i.e.*, publication, letter, memorandum, book, telegram, chart etc., or some other means of identifying the document, and its present location and custodian;
- (4) A communication, means to state its date and place, the person(s) who participated in it or who were present during any part of it or who have knowledge about it;
- (5) A date, means to state the date and set forth the basis for your contention that the date is responsive to the request; and
- (6) A product, service, or intellectual property, means to state all names and numbers related to the product, service, or intellectual property, and the owner, manufacturer, distributor, licensor, or dealer of the product, service, or intellectual property during the relevant time period and currently. For a product, provide all designations for the product, from the most specific to the most general, including any model numbers or designations, version numbers or designations, and internal numbers or designations.
- 18. The terms "Vizio," "you," "defendant," or "your" shall refer to Vizio, Inc., and includes any entities constituting parents, predecessors, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, associated organizations, joint ventures, as well as present and

former officers, directors, trustees, employees, staff members, agents, or other representatives, including counsel and patent agents, in any country.

- 19. The term "plaintiff" or "Sony" means Sony Corporation.
- 20. The term "AmTRAN" shall refer to AmTRAN Technology Co., Ltd., and includes any entities constituting parents, predecessors, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, associated organizations, joint ventures, as well as present and former officers, directors, trustees, employees, staff members, agents, or other representatives, including counsel and patent agents, in any country. The term shall include, but shall not be limited to, AmTRAN Logistics, Inc., AseV Display Labs, and AmTRAN Technology Inc.
- 21. The term "person" or "persons" refers to any individual, corporation, proprietorship, association, joint venture, company, partnership or other business or legal entity, including governmental bodies and agencies. The masculine includes the feminine and vice versa; the singular includes the plural and vice versa.
- 22. The terms "any," "all" and "each" shall each mean and include the other.
- 23. The terms "and" and "or" shall be construed either disjunctively or conjunctively as necessary to bring within the scope of the discovery request all responses that might otherwise be construed to be outside of its scope.
- 24. The use of the singular form of any word includes the plural and vice versa.
- 25. "Thing" refers to any physical specimen or tangible item in your possession, custody or control, including research and development samples, prototypes, productions samples and the like.
- 26. "Referring to," "relating to," "concerning" or "regarding" means containing, describing, discussing, embodying, commenting upon, identifying,

incorporating, summarizing, constituting, comprising or are otherwise pertinent to the matter or any aspect thereof.

- 27. The term "this action" means the above-captioned action, <u>Sony Corp. v. Vizio, Inc.</u>, case number SA CV08-01135-RGK (FMOx).
- 28. The term "License" means any agreement, contract, or arrangement relating to one or more patents.
- 29. The term "superimposed" means displayed over at least one other image such that both the superimposed image (e.g., a caption, a subtitle, a menu, etc.) and the underlying image(s) are seen, at least in part, at once.
- 30. "Level of transparency" means the extent to which a superimposed image blocks out or leaves visible an underlying image or background.
- 31. The term "Video Processor" means an integrated circuit that can perform analysis, manipulation, storage, or display of graphical images, graphical signals, or graphical data.
- 32. The term "Graphics Processor" means an integrated circuit that can generate and/or display graphical images such as lines and filled areas, or that can cause or facilitate the generation and/or display of graphical images.
- 33. The term "Dynamic Contrast" means automatically adjusting the contrast based on the picture brightness or luminance and/or dynamically enhancing the black and white levels.
- 34. The term "Source Code" means any software, programming code, or microprocessor instructions. The terms includes but is not limited to all Source Code, middleware, millicode, firmware, bytecode, compiled executable files, and makefiles.
- 35. The term "sales representative" or "sales representatives" includes any employee, independent contractor, agent, or distributor who attempts to sell or offers to sell your products or services.

51451/2839093.3

- 36. The term "contractor" means party who has contracted with you to perform work or deliver goods or services that related to the Vizio Products.
- 37. The term "Competitive Products" means any product, device, or instrumentality that by itself or in combination with any other product, device, or instrumentality is capable of displaying digital video signals manufactured by entities other than you.
- 38. The term "user manuals" mean any Documents that explain how to use or operate the Vizio Products.
- 39. The term "training materials" mean any Documents that facilitate the use or operation of the Vizio Products.
- 40. The term "packaging materials" mean any Documents that are provided to the a purchaser of any of the Vizio Products.
- 41. The term "marketing materials" mean any Documents used to market, disseminate knowledge of, or promote any of the Vizio Products. "Marketing material" Documents may include public relations works, press releases, product announcements, brochures, flyers, billboards or outdoor copy, video, audio, magazine or print media copy, emails, banners, displays or similar materials.
- 42. The use of a verb in any tense shall be construed as the use of the verb in all other tenses.
- 43. Sony requests that Documents be produced in same file or other organizational environment in which they are maintained in the ordinary course of business. For example, a Document that is part of a file, docket or other grouping should be physically produced together with all other Documents from said file, docket or grouping, in the same order or manner of arrangement as the original. Additionally, to the extent produced in hardcopy, each Document should be produced stapled, clipped or otherwise bound or connected in the same manner as the original. File folders with tabs or labels or directories of files identifying

Documents must be produced intact with such Documents. Documents attached to each other shall not be separated.

- 44. All Documents that respond, in whole or in part, to any portion of any request shall be produced in their entirety, including all attachments and enclosures.
- 45. Each Document is to be produced along with all non-identical drafts thereof in its entirety, without abbreviation or redaction.
- 46. Color copies of Documents are to be produced where color is necessary to interpret or understand the contents.
- 47. The source(s) or derivation of each Document produced shall be specifically identified.
- 48. If no Documents exist that are responsive to a particular request, that fact should be stated in each of Vizio's responses to such requests.
- 49. Separately with respect to each piece of information called for by these requests which is withheld under a claim of privilege or otherwise, provide an explanation of the claim being asserted and a description of the information withheld in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5).
- 50. In the event that any Document called for by these requests or subsequent requests is to be withheld on the basis of a claim of privilege or immunity from discovery, that Document is to be identified by stating (i) the author(s), addressee(s) and any indicated or blind copyee(s); (ii) the Document's date, number of pages and attachments or appendices; (iii) the subject matter(s) of the Document; (iv) the nature of the privilege or immunity asserted; and (v) all additional facts on which you would base your claim of privilege or immunity.
- 51. In the event that any Document called for by these requests or subsequent requests has been destroyed or discarded, that Document is to be identified by stating: (i) the author(s), addressee(s) and any indicated or blind copyee(s); (ii) the Document's date, number of pages and attachments or appendices; (iii) the

51451/2839093.3

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
l	0	
L	1	
L	2	
L	3	
l	4	
Ĺ	5	
	6	
L	7	
	8	
	9	
2	0 1	
,	2	1

Document's subject matter; (iv) the date of destruction or discard, manner of destruction or discard, and reason for destruction or discard; (v) the persons who were authorized to carry out such destruction or discard; and (vi) whether any copies of the Document presently exist and, if so, the name of the custodian of each copy.

- 52. Electronic records and computerized information must be produced in their native electronic format, together with a description of the system from which they were derived sufficient to permit rendering the records and information intelligible.
- 53. Selection of Documents from the files and other sources and the numbering of such Documents shall be performed in such a manner as to ensure that the source of each Document may be determined, if necessary.
- 54. If your response to a particular request for production is a statement that you lack the ability to comply with that request, you must specify whether the inability to comply is because the particular item or category of information never existed, has been destroyed, has been lost, misplaced, or stolen, or has never been, or is no longer, in your possession, custody, or control, in which case the name and address of any person or entity known or believed by you to have possession, custody, or control of that information or category of information must be identified.
- 55. Unless otherwise indicated in a particular request, the request is not date or time limited.
- 56. The obligation to provide the information sought by these requests is continuing within the requirement of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e).

### REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:**

A fully operational exemplar of each of the Vizio Products.

28

23

24

25

26

# REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2: All Documents that concern any of the patents-in-suit, including Documents concerning the file histories thereto.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:**

All Documents concerning any discussion with third parties regarding Sony patents.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

Documents sufficient to determine the model number of each Vizio Product.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

Documents sufficient to determine the model number of each Related Vizio Product.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

Documents sufficient to determine each Graphics Processor and/or Video Processor incorporated in each Vizio Product.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:**

Documents sufficient to correlate the model number of each Vizio Product with any and all other internal numbers or designations associated with that product.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:**

Documents sufficient to correlate any technical documentation concerning each Vizio Product with financial documentation (e.g., documents showing unit sales, revenues, etc.) associated with that product.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:**

Documents sufficient to show when, where, and by whom, each of the Vizio Products was manufactured.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:**

For each sale of a Vizio Product, Documents sufficient to show when, where, and by whom, the Vizio Product was sold.

28

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:			
2	Documents sufficient to show the place of manufacture and the place of sale			
. 3	for each unit of each Vizio Product and the dollar amount of sales associated with			
4	such unit.			
5	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:			
6	All Documents concerning any Vizio licensing policies.			
7	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:			
8	All patent license agreements Vizio has entered into in which Vizio is the			
9	licensee.			
10	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:			
11	All Documents concerning any patent license granted to, or obtained by,			
12	Vizio that covers in whole or in part any of the Vizio Products.			
13	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:			
14	All Documents concerning any document management systems or processes			
15	for handling documents relating to any of the Vizio Products.			
16	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:			
17	All Documents concerning any databases for storing data relating to any of			
18	the Vizio Products.			
19	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:			
20	All Documents relating to the menu display and/or picture-in-picture			
21	functionality of the Vizio Products or the Related Vizio Products.			
22	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:			
23	All Documents that relate to the closed caption functionality of the Vizio			
24	Products or the Related Vizio Products.			
25	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:			
26	All Documents that relate to the subtitle display functionality of the Vizio			
27	Products or the Related Vizio Products.			
28				

51451/2839093.3

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:**

All Documents that relate to the menu display functionality of the Vizio Products or the Related Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:**

All Documents that relate to the video processing and transmission functionality of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:**

All Documents that relate to the gamma correction and/or dynamic contrast functionality of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:**

All Documents that relate to the channel selection functionality of the Vizio Products or the Related Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

All Documents that describe the operation of the Vizio Products or the Related Vizio Products, including, but not limited to, user manuals, service manuals, training materials, packaging materials and marketing materials.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

Documents, including, any charts, schematics, drawing or figures, sufficient to show how, where, when, and by whom each of the Vizio Products was manufactured and/or assembled.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:**

All Documents that relate to the design and development of each of the Vizio Products and each component thereof, including, without limitation, all notebooks, diagrams, progress reports, studies, internal memoranda, contracts for services, and Communications.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:**

All Documents that relate to whether Vizio infringes the patents-in-suit, including, without limitation, all Documents that relate to any investigation or analysis thereof.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:**

All Documents that relate to Vizio's contention that the patents-in-suit are invalid, including, without limitation, all Documents that relate to any investigation or analysis thereof.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:**

All Documents that relate to any prior art search concerning the patents-insuit, including search requests, reports, analyses, and references located.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:**

All English translations of any foreign patent or publication on which you intend to rely as prior art to any of the patents-in-suit.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:**

All copies of any patents, publications, or other references that Vizio contends are themselves prior art or evidence prior art to one or more of the patents-in-suit.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:**

All Documents that relate to devices, products, systems, apparatuses, or other instrumentalities that Vizio contends are prior art to one or more of the patents-insuit.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:**

All Documents that demonstrate or evidence any alleged prior conception and/or reduction to practice of the subject matter claimed in the patents-in-suit.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:**

All Documents that Vizio relies on or intends to rely on for any of its affirmative defenses.

27 28

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:** Documents sufficient to determine the following on a monthly or quarterly 2 basis from October 10, 2002 for the Vizio Products, including components thereof: 3 Total gross and net revenues (by product, customer, period and 4 5 location); Total quantity of units sold (by product, customer, period and 6 b. 7 location); Cost of goods sold, including but not limited to, direct purchases, 8 direct labor, indirect and/or overhead costs, and any allocation of those direct, indirect and/or overhead costs to the Vizio Products; 11 d. Actual total cost or variances from standard costs; Gross and net profits; and 12 e. f. All costs other than standard costs, including but not limited to, 13 selling, advertising, general and administrative expenses, and any allocation of those 14 expenses to the Vizio Products. 15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:** 16 17 All Documents relating to the marketing and sale of the Vizio Products. **REOUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:** 18 Documents sufficient to identify all entities involved in the sale and 19 distribution of the Vizio Products. 20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:** 21 Documents sufficient to identify the role or contribution of all entities 22 involved in the sale and distribution of the Vizio Products. 23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:** 24 Documents sufficient to identify all entities involved in the sale and 25 distribution of the Related Vizio Products. 26

51451/2839093.3

27

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:**

Documents sufficient to identify the role or contribution of all entities involved in the sale and distribution of the Related Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:**

All Documents that relate to when and how Vizio first became aware of each of the patents-in-suit.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:**

All Documents reflecting Communications concerning the patents-in-suit or other Sony patents.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43:**

All Documents that relate to or evidence any Licenses, or the negotiation thereof, relating to the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44:**

All Documents that relate to or evidence any Licenses, or the negotiation thereof, relating to the technology claimed or disclosed by the patents-in-suit.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45:**

All patent licenses in which Vizio has received or conveyed rights.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46:**

All Documents reflecting or created in the course of any patent licensing negotiations in which Vizio has been involved.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47:**

All Documents that are material to the calculation of the reasonable royalty rate that Vizio contends Vizio and Sony would have agreed upon in a hypothetical negotiation.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48:**

All Documents that relate to the size or potential size of the market for each of the Vizio Products.

28

27

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 49:**

All Documents that relate to any agreement under which Vizio pays royalties on sales of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50:**

All licenses and agreements between AmTRAN and Vizio.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51:**

All Documents that reflect any licenses or agreements between AmTRAN and Vizio.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 52:**

All Documents reflecting AmTRAN's ownership in Vizio.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53:**

All Documents that relate to any agreement under which any third party receives, or is entitled to receive, any proceeds from the sale of any of the Vizio Products.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54:**

All Documents concerning sales forecasts, budgets, expenses, costs, and profitability of the Vizio Products.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:**

All Documents that relate to (1) any written or oral opinions received or solicited by Vizio that relate to the validity, enforceability, infringement, or scope of any claims of the patents-in-suit and (2) the preparation of any such opinions, including, but not limited to, drafts, notes, and any Documents relied on in the preparation of any such opinions.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:**

All opinions of counsel relating to any of the patents-in-suit.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57:**

All Documents concerning any of Vizio's policies, practices, or guidelines regarding the patent rights of others, including the analysis of patents to ensure you do not infringe such patents.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:**

All Documents concerning any test, study, experimentation, or investigation conducted to determine whether any product manufactured or sold by Vizio infringes any of the patents-in-suit or uses any Sony technology.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:**

All Documents relating to any test, study, experimentation, or investigation conducted by or on behalf of Vizio in an effort to design around any of the patents-in-suit.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:**

All Documents in Vizio's possession that belong to Sony or contain confidential Sony information.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:**

Documents sufficient to show Vizio's organizational structure from October 10, 2002 to the present, including but not limited to organizational charts and personnel charts.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:**

Documents sufficient to show the officers, employees and other Vizio personnel who are or have been involved in the design, testing, manufacture, marketing, sale, or importation of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:**

All Documents that relate to Vizio's document destruction and/or document retention policies.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:**

Documents sufficient to show the structure of Vizio's e-mail system and any manner of automatic deletion of e-mail.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65**

All Documents identified, consulted, or referred to by Vizio in its responses to any interrogatory served by Sony in this action, including Sony's First Set of Interrogatories served herewith.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:**

All Documents that Vizio contends relate to the scope or meaning of any claims of the patents-in-suit.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67:**

All Documents that relate to this action, including, but not limited to, press releases, submissions to government agencies, and Communications with third parties.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 68:**

All Source Code that relates to any of the Vizio Products or the Related Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 69:**

All Source Code used to operate or enable the function of every integrated circuit incorporated into the Vizio Products that performs any part of the functions of a Video Processor and/or a Graphics Processor, whether stored on the processor itself or in external memory.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 70:**

All Documents that relate to any Source Code used to operate or enable any functionality of any of the Vizio Products, including but not limited to algorithms, flowcharts, diagrams, notes, and manuals.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 71:**

All Documents that relate to any Source Code used to operate or enable any functionality of any of the Related Vizio Products, including but not limited to algorithms, flowcharts, diagrams, notes, and manuals.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '626 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the menu display and/or picture-in-picture functionality of the Vizio Products.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '577 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the close caption functionality of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '542 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the subtitle display functionality of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '847 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the subtitle display functionality of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '373 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the display of

26 27

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

51451/2839093.3

1	me
2	me
3	<u>R</u> 1
4	
5	6'
6	dis
7	RI
8	
9	60:
10	pr
11	RI
12	
13	<b>'</b> 4
14	СО
15	<u>R</u> 1
16	
17	1:
18	СО

menu items and the display and/or selection of hierarchical menus, subordinate menus, and/or submenus.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 77:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '614 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the menu display functionality of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 78:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the f055 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the video processing and transmission functionality of the Vizio Products.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 79:**

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the 468 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the video data communication functionality of the Vizio Products.

## REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 80:

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '182 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to the dynamic contrast functionality of the Vizio Products.

# 19 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 81:

All Source Code that relates to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '472 patent, including, without limitation, all Source Code relating to channel selection, including any channel selection related to major and minor channel numbers.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 82:**

All Documents that relate to any joint defense agreement in this action or in any related litigation.

27

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 83:**

All Documents that relate to any Communications with any third parties regarding the Vizio Products, the patents-in-suit, or this action, including but not limited to Communications with AmTRAN or Westinghouse Digital Electronics, LLC.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 84:**

All Documents that relate to collaborations, partnerships, agreements, joint ventures, licenses, or other arrangements considered or entered into by Vizio for the purpose of designing, developing, manufacturing, selling or distributing any of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 85:**

All Documents that relate to intellectual property agreements or other arrangements that relate to intellectual property considered or entered into by Vizio for the purpose of designing, developing, manufacturing, selling or distributing any of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 86:**

All Documents that relate to the marketing, advertising, or promotion of any of the Vizio Products, including but not limited to advertising materials, catalogs, brochures, data sheets, promotional materials, speeches, interviews, press releases, publications, trade releases, new product releases, trade notices, and web pages.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 87:**

All Documents that relate to the marketing, advertising, or promotion of any of the Related Vizio Products, including but not limited to advertising materials, catalogs, brochures, data sheets, promotional materials, speeches, interviews, press releases, publications, trade releases, new product releases, trade notices, and web pages.

21.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 88:**

Documents sufficient to show all of Vizio's sales, leases, or other placements, in units and dollars, for each of the Vizio Products, including the date of sale, date of shipment, and name of customer with respect to each sale.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 89:**

All Documents that relate to any analysis of Vizio's actual or projected gross profits, net profits, gross profit margins, and net profit margins, relating to any of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:**

All Documents that relate to any product reviews, comparisons, or usability tests or evaluations of any of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:**

All Documents that relate to any plans, proposals, or decisions to improve, downgrade, or otherwise change any features or functionality of any of the Vizio Products.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:**

All Documents that relate to any studies, surveys, investigations, reports, considerations of, analyses of, or any plans or proposed plans for, beginning, expanding, decreasing, continuing, or discontinuing research, development, testing, production, or sales as to any of the Vizio Products.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 93:**

All Documents that you have provided to or received from any person who may testify at trial or at any hearing in this action.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 94:**

All Documents created or provided to any expert retained to testify in this case, and all transcripts of prior testimony (whether at deposition, trial, declaration, or affidavit) by the retained expert.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 95:** 1 All Communications between Vizio and any expert retained to testify in this 3 action. **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:** 4 All Communications between Vizio and any witness that is expected to testify 5 in this action. 6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 97:** 8 All Documents identified in Vizio's Rule 26 disclosures. **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 98:** All Documents that Vizio relies on or intends to rely on for any of its 10 Affirmative Defenses. 11 12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 99:** 13 All Documents that Vizio may use or will use at any trial or at any hearing in this matter. 14 15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:** 16 All Documents identified, mentioned, referenced, reviewed, or relied upon in the preparation of Vizio's answers to Sony's Interrogatories in this action. 17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:** 18 19 All Licenses, whether Vizio is the licensor or licensee, relating to any of the Vizio Products, including but not limited to licenses relating to the technologies 20 21 claimed or disclosed by the patents-in-suit. 22 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 102:** All Documents and Communications relating to any license relating to any of 23

27

28

24

25

26

the Vizio Products.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 103:** 

51451/2839093.3

All settlement agreements relating to any of the Vizio Products, including but

	ľ	
1		n
2		d
3		]
4		
5		re
6		F
7		
8		С
9		la
8 9 10		F
11		
12		tł
13		F
14		
15		tl
16		F
17		
18		p
19		r
20		E
21		
22		o
	۱	_

not limited to, settlement agreements relating to the technologies claimed or disclosed by the patents-in-suit.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 104:**

All Documents and Communications relating to any settlement agreement relating to any of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 105:**

All Documents and Communications relating to any patent infringement claim or action, whether or not such claim or action has been filed before a court of law, that concerns any of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 106:**

A fully operational exemplar of any device, machine, apparatus, or other thing that Vizio contends is prior art to any claim of any of the Patents-in-suit.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 107:**

All Documents relating to the distribution within, import to, or export from the United States of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 108:**

All Documents relating to any analysis of Vizio's actual or projected gross profits, net profits, gross profit margins, and net profit margins in the United States relating to each Vizio Product.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 109:**

All Documents relating to business plans and projections, sales forecasts, or other business planning relating to the Vizio Products.

## REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 110:

Documents sufficient to show the efforts taken by Vizio to sell other products or services together, or in connection, with the Vizio Products or to effect the sale thereof by third parties, including, but not limited to, distributors and retailers.

27

24

25

26

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 111:**

Documents sufficient to show the terms of any extended service plan and/or warranty sold together or in connection with the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 112:**

Documents sufficient to show for each Vizio Product, any other products or services sold together, or in connection, with that product and the revenue generated thereby.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 113:**

Documents sufficient to show for each Vizio Product any extended service plan and/or warranty sold together or in connection with that product and the revenue generated thereby.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 114:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '468 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the video processing and transmission functionality of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 115:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '182 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the Vizio Products' use, correction, or adjustment of gamma luminance or color difference.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 116:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '626 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the menu display and/or picture-in-picture functionality of the Vizio Products.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 117:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '577 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the close caption functionality of the Vizio Products.

28

27

2

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

51451/2839093.3

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 118:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '542 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the subtitle display functionality of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 119:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '847 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the subtitle display functionality of the Vizio Products.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 120:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '373 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the display of menu items and the display and/or selection of hierarchical menus, subordinate menus, and/or submenus.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 121:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '614 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the menu display functionality of the Vizio Products.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 122:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '055 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to the video processing and transmission functionality of the Vizio Products.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 123:**

All Documents that relate to the technology claimed or disclosed in the '472 patent, including, without limitation, all Documents relating to channel selection, including any selection related to major and minor channel numbers.

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 124:** 2 Documents sufficient to show the ownership structure of Vizio, including the names and addresses of any owners of or investors in Vizio. 4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 125:** 5 Documents sufficient to identify all Vizio employees who have ever received confidential Sony information. 6 7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 126:** All Documents containing confidential Sony information. 8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 127:** All Documents reflecting any testing of the Vizio Products by or on behalf of 10 11 Vizio. 12 13 14

# **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 128:**

All Documents reflecting any test protocols for testing of the Vizio Products by or on behalf of Vizio.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 129:**

All Documents relating to Vizio's participation in any industry groups or associations, including standard-setting organizations.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 130:**

All Documents relating to Sony's participation in any industry groups or associations, including standard-setting organizations.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 131:**

All Documents relating to any obligations owed by Vizio and/or Sony to any industry groups or associations, including standard-setting organizations, and/or their members.

# REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 132:

All Documents that support Vizio's contention that Sony is barred from recovering damages under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

28

27

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 133:**

All Documents that support Vizio's contention that one or more of the claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid for failing to meet conditions for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 134:**

All Documents that support any contention by Vizio that one or more of the patents-in-suit is unenforceable for any reason including, without limitation, laches, equitable estoppel, express or implied license, exhaustion, intervening rights. express or implied waiver, inequitable conduct, patent misuse, unclean hands, and/or prosecution laches.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 135:**

All Documents produced or made available to Vizio by any non-party or third-party pursuant to any subpoena in this action.

DATED: March 23, 2009

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP

Bode I FOR

TORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Sony Corporation

25

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

26 27

1 PROOF OF SERVICE I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 2 eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is Now Legal Service. 3 1301 W. 2nd Street, Suite 206, Los Angeles, CA 90026. On March 23, 2009, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as 4 5 1) SONY'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO VIZIO 6 2) SONY'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO VIZIO on the parties in this action as follows: 8 Steven John Corr Jones Day 9 555 South Flower Street 50th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 10 213-243-2327 Fax: 213-243-2539 11 12 [X] BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I delivered such envelope(s) by hand to the office of the 13 person(s) being served. 14 I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made. 15 Executed on March 23, 2009, at Los Angeles, C 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27